DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 437 SP 030 977

AUTHOR Pine, Gerald; Keane, William
TITLE Collaboration for Educational Excellence and Equity: Lessons Learned.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Anaheim, CA, March 2-5, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Action Research; *College School Cooperation; Community Colleges; *Curriculum Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Cooperation; Public Schools; Schools of Education; *Staff Development
IDENTIFIERS Michigan (Oakland County)

ABSTRACT

Educational collaboratives are organizations in which educational administrators, university and college faculty, classroom teachers, intermediate district staff, and graduate and undergraduate students share energy, expertise, time, and other resources to plan and implement joint programs of preservice and inservice education, action research, curriculum development, and staff development for the purpose of achieving mutual goals for the improvement of education. Case studies are presented which document collaborative efforts involving at one time or another a university, community college, two intermediate school districts, and a number of local school districts in addressing the issues of quality, integrity, and efficiency in education. These collaboratives were established and continue to operate primarily in Oakland County, contiguous to the city of Detroit. Oakland County encompasses a variety of local school districts--large and small; urban, suburban, and rural; affluent and poor. Representatives of the public schools, Oakland University, Oakland Community College and the Oakland schools have formed several educational collaboratives and have learned a great deal about the characteristics of effective institutional collaboration. (JD)

COLLABORATION FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE AND EQUITY: LESSONS LEARNED

Gerald Pine, Dean
School of Human and Educational Services
Oakland University
Rochester, Michigan 48309-4401

William Keane, Superintendent
Oakland Schools Intermediate School District
2100 Pontiac Lake Road
Pontiac, Michigan 48054

AACTE
Annaheim, California
March, 1989

THE CONTEXT FOR COLLABORATION

Education is in great ferment. The educational reform movement has created a new climate for discussion about our schools, teachers, and teacher education. We are engaged in a great national debate about the quality and effectiveness of education. Several questions fuel the debate. What actions can be taken to improve the quality, integrity, and efficiency of education? How can we improve our educational institutions to make our country more productive and competitive in a world economy? What needs to be done to enhance quality in curriculum, teaching, and teacher education? What are the best ways to use our resources to improve the quality of education? How can we achieve excellence and equity in education? There is no shortage of answers. Numerous studies have been published and more are on the way prescribing solutions for problems in education.

A common prescription for curing contemporary educational ills is collaboration. Collaboration is in the wind - part of a wider social movement to cope with the restructuring of the industrial economy and a contemporary culture of mergers, networks, coalitions, and reorganization. Society and its institutions have become interdependent on an unprecedented scale with the consequence that collaboration is frequently viewed as a natural process like the process of symbiosis in nature in which two different organisms derive benefit from each other and guarantee the others continued existence. As Thomas (1980) observes:

> "The urge to form partnerships, to link up in collaborative arrangements, is perhaps the oldest, strongest, and most fundamental force in nature. There are no solitary, free living creatures: every form of life is dependent on other forms. The great successes in evolution, the mutants who have so to speak, made it, have done so by fitting in with, and sustaining the rest of life. Up to now we might be counted among the brilliant successes, but flashy and perhaps unstable. We should go warily into the future, looking for ways to be more useful, listening more carefully for the signals, watching our step, and having an eye out for partners."

In a similar vein Alvin Toffler (1980) argues that the survival or organizations, institutions, and society will depend upon the ability of autonomous units and entities to collaborate in achieving common goals and objectives. In a changing, complicated and challenging society, the interrelationships among once separate and independent subgroups grow as organizations find themselves ecologically bound to each other. It is clear that once autonomous organizations cannot continue to operate independently, and indeed there is growing recognition that through collaborative efforts organizations can learn to improve their effectiveness. It is evident that collaborative efforts have great potential to improve the quality of education particularly given the more recent phenomenon of the dissaggregation of expertise and institutional roles and functions.

One of the most significant social phenomena in society is - disaggregation - unique roles, functions, and expertise which used to

clearly define institutional identities and missions - have become disaggregated so that institutional missions and roles are overlapping (Hodgkinson, 1981). At one time, for example, we thought of money in terms of one institution; banks. However, today we encounter a vast array of financial businesses. Several years ago who would have thought that Sears would be the number one lender of money in the United States? Disaggregation of expertise, roles, and functions is taking place in a variety of fields, including education.

From:

Education	Money	Research	Health
Colleges	Banks	Universities	Hospitals

To:

Colleges	Banks	Universities	Hospitals
Business	Sears	Business	HMO's
Government	HFC	Private R&D	Fitness Centers
Military	Money Market	Military	Hospices
Unions	Barter	Government	YMCAs
Civic Groups			Business

Functions Now More Specialized. "Narrow Band."

Considering the trend of disaggregation among our major institutions what is the role of the university in school improvement? What is the role of public schools?" Are there unique roles? To what extent do the traditional functions of the university, local education agencies, and state agencies overlap and complement each other? How does the disaggregation of educational expertise affect school improvement efforts? There is great potentiality in collaboration to harness the disaggregation of expertise to improve schools and enhance teacher education and professional development.

THE IMPERATIVE FOR COLLABORATION

Central to school improvement is the organizing principle that public schools, universities, intermediate school districts and the state departments of education are interrelated and interacting parts of a single education system. We are bound in a common enterprise - the development of human talent. The development and productivity of our environment and our communities will largely be determined in the short

and long term by human talents and abilities - especially those of our children and youth whose intellectual capacities and skills will be critical to the future of our nation.

Teacher preparation and professional development are key elements in improving the quality of education and offer a common ground for collaboration for schools and universities. The basis for collaboration is found in several major questions that have confronted educators for many years:

1. How can pre-service and in-service teacher education be successfully linked?

2. How can curriculum development and staff development be effectively integrated?

3. How can generally diverse educational constitutencies (students, teachers, administrators, supervisors, college and university staff, interested community) best share experiences and resources?

4. How can teachers, principals, and other school personnel be continually renewed? How can university faculty be challenged to change-and-grow?

5. How can school districts confront the increasing pressures to be more accountable, to generate more community involvement and participation in educational programming and decision making, and to confront the complex educational issues brought on by a rapidly changing information society.

6. How can universities, faced with problems of program redundancies and pressures for being more accountable, use their finite resources in the most effective way to address the professional development needs of educational personnel, the challenges of school improvement, and the concerns for educational excellence and equity?

7. How can public colleges and universities, largely funded on a credit hour basis, play a meaningful role in teacher renewal, especially in a service area where 48.4% of teachers and administrators are over age 45 and 58% of them already have master's degrees and are not especially interested in credit accumulation.

These questions have commanded the attention of educators for the past twenty years and have been the basis for encouraging collaboration. The Higher Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-329), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (PL 89-10), Teacher Corps, and the Teacher Center movement emphasized and required collaboration to improve education. But all too often when external funding was reduced collaboration withered. The questions challenging educators remain and there is hope that the renewed emphasis on collaboration emanating from the school reform movement will

suggest new forms of collaboration which will not always be subject to the vagaries of government funding.

One of the more encouraging features of the school reform movement has been a renewed emphasis on the importance of quality teaching. Though much has been said and written for generations about the critical need for effective teaching, the proportion of school budgets usually been embarrassingly small, especially when compared to the sums that private businesses invest in the continued training of their professional staff. For example, a recent study conducted jointly by the Far West Laboratory for Research and Development and the University of California at Berkeley's Policy for California Education discovered that only 1.8% of the state's total education budget is devoted to staff development. There are many reasons for this situation, including the chronic lack of funds for all purposes that many school districts have labored under for years.

In just the last few years there has been a sudden national interest in making education better, fueled in important ways by the leadership of many state governors. Highly publicized efforts have been initiated to give merit pay for better teaching, recruit more intelligent and talented college students into the education profession, and, perhaps most important in the short run, help teachers use a sound theoretical base for designing learning experiences for students.

Too often in the past the effort to find and train better beginning teachers and the task of upgrading the skills of practicing teachers would have been largely thought of as separate tasks. Pre-service teacher training was considered the formal task of the college of education. Professors would become involved in in-service education but only as individual entrepreneurs. Local districts were expected to bear the burden of retraining practicing teachers, sometimes through the assistance of programs emanating from the state department of education staff and, in some states, by offerings available from a regional service agency.

It is, to use an old cliche, a new ball game. Local school officials can't just wait for trained teachers to "come off the assembly line." They need to help shape the kind of training teachers will get if they want assurance that these new teachers will be able to teach the new curricula for tomorrow's schools. Colleges need to be involved in the retraining of practicing teachers if they are to understand first hand the changing demands that are being made on classroom teachers. Business is becoming increasingly strident, perhaps justifiably, in wanting to influence what happens in schools. Research on effective schools points to the need to involve parents as well as the rest of the community in important decisions if a school is to improve.

THE POTENTIALITIES OF COLLABORATION

Implicit within the response to these challenges are the potentialities of institutional collaboration. One is the opportunity to adjust old forms to new realities, without surrendering existing advantages. Collaboration offers the potentiality of developing the required critical mass for professional stimulation, for attacking common problems, and for

operating complex and costly programs. Each organization can expand possibilities without having to spread thin. This is a new way of extending institutional responsibility and action to new areas without threatening institutional integrity.

Other potentialities for educational institutions are a more sensible division of labor among partners, an avoidance of duplication, a sharing of costs and resources, capitalizing on economies of scale, shared risks in trying out new ideas, an amplified voice and enlarged representation with industry, government, and foundations; and an enhanced capacity to attract outside funds.

Universities, intermediate school districts, local school districts, and other educational agencies have important roles in the educational improvement process but will realize their full potential in the context of collaborative partnerships in which the resources and expertise of the partnership are shared in mutually supportive and complementary ways. Through collaboration educational institutions can, in theory, do whatever they can agree upon. Hence, the principle limitation on the potential of collaboration is in will and not in power.

CASE STUDIES OF COLLABORATION FOR QUALITY, EQUITY, AND LEADERSHIP

The following case studies document collaborative efforts involving at one time or another a university, community college, two intermediate school districts, and a number of local school districts in addressing the issues of quality, equity, integrity, and efficiency in education. These collaboratives were established and continue to operate primarily in Oakland County, contiguous to the city of Detroit. Oakland County has a population of over one million people and encompasses a variety of local school districts -- large and small; urban, suburban, and rural; affluent and poor. Representatives of the public schools, Oakland University, Oakland Community College, and Oakland Schools (the county regional service agency) have formed several educational collaboratives and have learned a great deal about the characteristics of effective institutional collaboration.

Collaboration is herein defined as a joint endeavor of autonomous units, in our case educational entities, to achieve outcomes desired by all parties but beyond the grasp of any one of the units acting along. It is a partnership in a theoretical but not a legal sense. Unlike legal partnerships, collaboratives can be informally organized, ad hoc in their purposes, and quickly modified, incremented, or dissolved as circumstances dictate and goals change.

Educational collaboratives are organizations in which educational administrators, university and college faculty, classroom teachers, intermediate district staff, and graduate and undergraduate students share energy, expertise, time, and other resources to plan and implement joint programs of preservice and inservice education, action research, curriculum development, and staff development for the purpose of achieving mutual goals for the improvement of education.

OAKLAND EDUCATIONAL COLLABORATIVE

The American public education system has been highly decentralized since its inception. The federal role has been relatively narrow and carefully targeted. The strength of this approach is its flexibility in responding to local needs and interests. If this system has a weakness it is the fragmentation that results when coordination is loose at the state level and non-existent at the national level. Articulation is often a problem even within districts. Coordination and articulation between K-12 and higher education is practically non-existent.

Harold Hodgkinson has noted that people working at any level within the American education enterprise "...perceive it as a set of discrete institutions working in isolation from each other....People working in (educational institutions at whatever level) have virtually no connection with all the others and little awareness of educational activity provided by the total."

A new set of leaders for the educational institutions within Oakland County, Michigan were fortuitously appointed in the 1980-81 academic year. Perhaps their attitudes were shaped by the economic difficulties that the state, and therefore education, were experiencing at the time. Perhaps the public outcry about the weaknesses of public education helped to develop common thinking patterns. Whatever the cause, the new president of the university in the county and the new dean of the School of Human and Educational Services within the university were committed to building working relationships with the twenty-eight public school districts in the county. The new superintendent of the regional service agency (intermediate school district) also felt the need to work toward a more integrated delivery system within the county. Meetings were held to share ideas and a missing link was soon recognized, the community college. The president of the university hosted a lunch for the regional superintendent, the community college president, the dean of the school of education and, by the time dessert was served, the Oakland Educational Collaborative was born.

The initial purpose of the Collaborative was well intentioned but somewhat inchoate; to build linkages between the various levels of education within the county by working together on joint projects to improve education. Determining the first area of cooperation took a considerable amount of discussion, but the group, now a set of operational staff appointed by the chief executives, finally settled on the area of writing.

Workshops to improve the teaching of writing were set up utilizing instructors from all levels. A resource directory identifying individuals at all levels who could consult with schools and individuals was also published and disseminated.

The Collaborative then moved into the area of foreign language instruction and began to network teachers from all three levels to discuss common problems and to offer teacher training workshops.

Shortly after this effort began, the Collaborative took a sharp turn in a new direction. The automobile companies, a major employer in Michigan, began to lay off thousands of workers in the metropolitan Detroit area. The companies and the auto unions began to thrash around looking for ways to assist these unfortunate individuals, many of whom were now out of a job after years of service. This assistance could take many forms including technical retraining, job search assistance, or psychological counseling. Not long after, as layoffs continued, though at a slower pace, the Big Three auto manufacturers and the UAW signed a national agreement which contained a significant amount of money for worker education and training for workers still on the job. This money could be spent in many different ways from completing a college education to getting basic literacy training.

The Collaborative decided that by working together and allowing all three levels of education to interface as a unit\it with the unions and auto companies three important goals could be achieved; divisive competition for contracts to perform education and training could be prevented, "one stop shopping" for educational services could be provided, thereby making educational services more conveniently accessible, and teams incorporating educators from different levels on the same project could be fashioned. The hypothesis was correct and many different and flexibly organized teams have been out together to help both laid off workers find a new job and help those still working become more competent to adapt to a rapidly changing work environment.

In this model of collaboration all three partners - pre-college, community college, and university staff have equal status, equal responsibility, and equivalent rules. Because of these similarities and in light of liability issues that are of concern to all agencies, the Collaborative is currently in the process of creating a non-profit corporation which will serve as the fiscal agent and service provider for these outside contracts.

MATH/SCIENCE/TECHNOLOGY HIGH SCHOOL

Roger Kaufman, one of America's leading theoreticians of strategic planning, has commented that school practitioners often have the need to "fly the airplane" while they are still designing it. This aphorism is well remembered in an attempt to describe a collaborative effort to design a magnet school focusing on math/science/high technology in Oakland County. This entity is still in the construction phase; there is a possibility it may never "fly".

Oakland County, one of the nation's fastest growing counties, is an important part of the southeast portion of Michigan, an area that is rapidly evolving into a national center of high technology. An important reason for this situation has been the development, under the auspices of Oakland University, of the Oakland Technology Park. Its prime tenant is the Chrysler Corporation, which selected this site as the home of its research and development arm. The presence of Chrysler has led many other national and international firms to locate their research and development

facilities at this site. Similar developments in other parts of the region are having an important impact on business, industry, real estate development and, perhaps surprisingly, education.

A few years ago, Michigan witnessed the development of its first regional high school devoted to the study of math, science, and technology. In this context regional is defined to mean a school designed to draw students from a number of school districts even though operated by one of the districts. It was the Kalamazoo Math and Science High School established largely through a grant of one million dollars and an endowment of another million dollars from the Upjohn Company, a pharmaceutical corporation which has its headquarters in Kalamazoo.

The governor of Michigan, anxious to continue the transition of the state toward being a national center of high technology, encouraged the state education department to foster the development of other high schools of this type throughout the state. The state board of education responded positively, and a competitive grant program was established to encourage replications of the Kalamazoo school or to develop other concepts for improving math and science instruction.

One of the key officials of Oakland University, a man who had played a significant role in establishing and then attracting other businesses to the Oakland Technology Park, heard about one visited the Kalamazoo school. He immediately saw the possibilities such a school might have in Oakland, the second most populous county in Michigan. Since so many companies in the park are engaged in state-of-the-art research in engineering, automated manufacturing, and applied physics and chemistry, he felt that proximity to some of the world's best scientists and engineers using the most advanced equipment would present a wonderful opportunity to enrich the science and math education of the over 170,000 students in the county.

The special opportunities would not be limited to young people. It would be possible to involve scientists, engineers, and business leaders in designing the content of modern math and science curricula. Interacting with these uniquely qualified individuals would inevitably impact what experienced teachers teach and how they teach at the school. The positive effects would go well beyond this school. These altered curricula and teaching methodologies would inevitably be transmitted to and utilized by teachers in the regular high schools throughout the county. The concept paper for the school includes the possibility of transmitting instruction for students and in-service training for teachers via cable and microwave to local school districts.

Developing a school within this geography also offered the opportunity to respond to some real problems facing the secondary schools of the county.

Though the severe enrollment declines experienced by most school districts throughout the nation during the 1970s and 80s have halted in Oakland County and total enrollments have generally been stabilized, this stability is a function of opposite trends within most districts; that is, elementary enrollments have begun to rise while secondary enrollments are continuing to decline.

The decline in secondary students has had a negative effect on the richness of course offerings, especially in math and science available in local high schools, especially the smaller ones within the county. Aggregating students at one site would offer many students the opportunity to study calculus, biochemistry, fortran programming, genetics and other math and science courses that could not be offered at the home school for lack of enrollment.

Seeing opportunities to be seized and problems to be solved, the university came to K-12 education as represented by the intermediate school district. Would the 28 school districts of the county be interested in attempting to create a magnet school specializing in math, science and high technology? The search for an answer began.

Autonomous local school district officials are usually not enthusiastic about specialized schools in general education. Though they quickly recognize the cost benefits of regional programs for severely handicapped students and for high cost vocational/technical education, they often view magnet schools as elitist. Further they fear that such schools will take away their best student in such numbers that outstanding local programs in science, music, or whatever other specialty is featured at the magnet school will not be possible. Declining secondary enrollments can also mean that a few students going to the magnet school can deprive others at the home school of the opportunity to take a specialized course because not enough students will be left behind to build a sufficiently large enrollment. Finally, magnet schools raise the spectre of additional costs for busing to get a small number of students to the more distant center.

Even more significant financial issues soon became apparent. While Michigan law provides opportunities for intermediate school districts to ask citizens for tax revenues to run special education and vocational education programs, there is no provision for acquiring separate funding for general education programs. The university, the intermediate district and local districts would all lack sufficient discretionary funds to establish such a venture. The state's incentive grants were really quite small, a maximum of $25,000 which required a match of three dollars from the applying unit for every dollar granted by the state.

Despite all the potential problems and objections, the intermediate unit joined in the journey toward a new type of high school. A small cadre of in-house consultants in math, science, and computer technology was brought together to discuss whether such a school would represent a positive increment to the educational opportunities in the county. The answer was positive. Next a small group of superintendents and curriculum directors was invited to react to the proposal for such a school. Though all the typical concerns were surfaced at this meeting, the group encouraged an even broader based study of the feasibility of such a school.

The next group consisted of all those involved in the previous meeting plus math and science curriculum specialists from additional local districts. Again all the typical issues were raised but grudging

encouragement was elicited. However, this group recommended that the county superintendents association be asked to approve development of such a school before local district curriculum staff devoted more time to the effort. They correctly reasoned that such a school wasn't going to exist unless it was supported by the superintendents, and no one wanted to spend a lot of time on a program that might be aborted by school leaders after all the work was done.

The idea was brought to the association and again the anticipated, and very real, concerns were raised. After considerable debate the association voted unanimously to support further development of the concept.

Now there were three partners in the venture - the university, the intermediate school district, and the local districts. However, the absence of solid funding made a fourth entity necessary in this collaboration - business. One or more businesses would have to be found to play a role analagous to the Upjohn Company in the development of the Kalamazoo Center. It was time for the university to move to center stage in moving the effort forward.

The university identified key business leaders from in and around the Technology Park and invited them to a special dinner to present the concept of the magnet school and to meet some of the K-12 educators working on the effort. The development of this project continues.

This project contains some unusual aspects of school collaboration. Though the target of the project will be K-12 students, it was initiated by a university. Though it is designed for general education students, critical funding to start the project is largely unavailable from traditional funding sources, discretionary dollars from local school districts budgets or categorical funding within the state aid bill. The small state grant to assist in start-up costs is helpful but not material in determining whether such a school can be established. A partnership with business, including financial support, is essential to get the project off the ground.

THE OAKLAND WRITING PROJECT

The success of the National Area Writing Project is well documented in the literature. Oakland Schools felt that the program would provide the kind of instruction much needed by teachers within the county's constituency, so the first iteration of this program in Michigan was planned for the summer of 1981.

A partnership with Oakland University seemed desirable for a number of reasons. All existing sites for the Project had institutions of higher education as sponsors, and this was the model preferred by the developers of the project. Joint sponsorship, and therefore college faculty involvement, would make locally based scholars available to present some of the material. A university affiliation would open up the opportunity for participants to earn college credit, another incentive for teachers to give up part of their summer to professional improvement. A proposal

was made to Oakland University and a collaborative effort with the Department of English and Rhetoric began.

The project raised some interesting, and not uncommon, issues for university and K-12 ventures. The project turned out to be a good test of the ability of cooperating institutions to maintain a harmonious working relationship when the partners have significantly different levels of responsibility for making the joint effort a success.

At the time the first offer of a partnership was made to the university, Oakland Schools had already set up the design and proposed content of the summer workshop. Many prestigious consultants in the field of writing had been hired to present one or more of the sessions. The workshop was scheduled to be held at the intermediate school district site for a variety of reasons including its location in the center of the county, ample parking, and well equipped training facilities.

Therefore, in the first year of the project, the university staff member had relatively few responsibilities. This person collected tuition money for those who wanted the tuition credit option and also taught a few classes.

Each year the program grew in size and popularity. Within two years the effort was replicated in a neighboring county. While the number of students grew slowly, the number to seek academic credit from the university grew rapidly. Some mumbling began among the school staff that the program, which, according to the original agreement, was returning a small proportion of tuition fees to the intermediate district as reimbursement for expenses, largely for the use of the building and course materials, was becoming a "cash cow" for the university. The intermediate unit was, they felt, unfairly expanding its own resources to recruit as speakers many state and national leaders in the field of writing.

The emerging controversy really had no villians. Both partners entered the project with a clear idea of what each other was expected to contribute to the joint effort, and each did what it was expected to do. Circumstances, however, soon required that the original relationship be examined. It can be a patience-testing process for two institutions which operate at different academic levels, each with its own set of procedures, requirements, and funding mechanisms, to arrive at mutually satisfactory decisions.

The tuition distribution issue was discussed by the operating staff of each institution, but university faculty quite correctly indicated that they did not have the authority to transfer more tuition funds to the intermediate unit. The superintendent of Oakland Schools was then asked to discuss the matter with the university provost. The conversation was friendly and mutually supportive. Because of the large number of collaborative efforts between the two institutions, there was a history of problems that had been faced and resolved. It became clear that Oakland University, as a public institution faced restrictions in sharing tuition funds with another institution, especially one that operated at another level of education. Nevertheless, some change in the tuition rebate amount was achieved as a result of this conversation.

However, a new set of problems emerged when, because of the increasing number of requests from teachers, the intermediate unit attempted to add a fall semester offering of what previously had been a program offered only in the summer. Administrative staff at the university raised concerns about the program running on a calendar different from the university's fall semester. They also objected to a university approved graduate program starting and ending earlier in the day then the regular graduate program.

To an uninformed observer the issues raised by university staff might seem trivial. To those faced with the complications of meeting accreditation requirements and assuring compatibility of offerings among the various schools within a university the identified issues have substance.

Again, intermediate staff and university leadership had to meet and resolve the new set of problems and revisit the matter of funding equity. Mutually satisfactory resolutions were achieved.

MEADOW BROOK LEADERSHIP ACADEMY

Meadow Brook Leadership Academy is an organization which reflects the collaboration of several institutions and groups in southeastern Michigan: Oakland University, Macomb Intermediate and Oakland Intermediate School Districts, and professional associations of principals, curriculum directors, and superintendents in Oakland and Macomb counties. The purpose of the Academy is to provide continuing education and professional development opportunities for school administrators.

Meadow Brook Leadership Academy evolved out of a series of discussions in the Spring of 1984 between the Dean of the School of Human and Educational Services at Oakland University, the Superintendents of Macomb and Oakland Intermediate School Districts, and the Director of Continuing Education at Oakland University. The context for these discussions included calls for state certification of school administrators to address the absence of any certification requirements for administrators in Michigan, a rapidly growing interest among administrators for management and leadership training, and the focus of the educational reform movement on the significant role of the principal in providing instructional leadership. Emanating from these informal discussions a planning session was held on June 26, 1984 at Meadow Brook Hall, a one hundred room estate and historical center located on the campus of Oakland University.

The purpose of the meeting was to assemble various stakeholders in administrative training to discuss the feasibility and desirability of a leadership academy. Attending this meeting were representatives of: superintendents, curriculum directors, and principals associations in Oakland and Macomb counties; Oakland University faculty and administration; the Michigan Association of School Administrators; the Detroit Metropolitan Bureau of School Studies; and the Superintendents of Oakland and Macomb Intermediate School Districts.

The initial concept of the Academy featured elements of flexibility, adaptability, responsiveness, and multiple approaches and formats. The Academy would offer one day seminars, weekend workshops, week long instituties, short term courses, and conventional courses for non credit, continuing education units, or graduate credits. The faculty would be drawn from school administrators, regional and national consultants, university faculty from a variety of disciplines, and business and industrial managers. The initial venture of the Academy was to be a series of ten to twelve one-day workshops. Participants who completed seven of the workshops would receive a Leadership Academy Certificate. The audience for the Academy would be principals, assistant superintendents, superintendents, and other school administrative personnel.

Dealing and grappling with the subleties and complexities generated by this initial concept of the Academy, forced several issues to emerge in the first planning session. There was consensus for supporting the concept of the Academy and for the name of the Academy -- Meadow Brook -- a name which conveys not only institutional neutrality but also high visibility and prestige because of the association with Meadow Brook Hall, a well known historical and prestigious site in Michigan. The questions of how to organize the Academy, what content should be offered, and for what specific administrative audience, loomed as central issues. At the conclusion of the June 26, 1984 meeting, it was decided that an informal steering committee consisting of representatives of Oakland University and the Macomb and Oakland Intermediate School Districts, would meet to reflect on the various issues raised in the meeting and to plan next steps.

Subsequently, a follow-up meeting of the steering committee held on July 11, 1984 at Oakland University produced the following outcomes:

For 1984-85 the focus on the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy would be on the continuing education and professional development needs of school principals.

A planning group of twelve principals -- six from each county -- would be selected by the Presidents of the principals associations in Oakland and Macomb Counties. Representatives among the principals in the planning group would reflect elementary, middle school, and secondary school interests. In addition to the principals, one curriculum director from each county, a consultant from each intermediate school district, a faculty member from the university, and the Dean of the School of Human and Educational Services would participate in the planning.

The planning group would convene prior to the beginning of the 1984-85 school year at Meadow Brook Hall to discuss the mission and purposes of a Principals' Center under the mantle of Meadow Brook Leadership Academy, to establish a schedule of meetings, and to plan activities for principals for the 1984-85 years.

Oakland University, Oakland Intermediate School District, and Macomb Intermediate School District would contribute an equal amount of funds as capital for the Principals Planning Group to pilot a series of activities for principals during the 1984-85 school year.

In preparation for the meeting materials describing the Harvard Principals Center and an evaluation of the Center's programs would be distributed to members of the Principals' Planning Group.

A research and program assistant would be appointed to support the Principals' Planning Group on matters relating to logistics, planning of meetings, telephone contacts, maintaining minutes of meetings, etc. so principals would be free to do the thinking and planning for effective inservice and professional development activities.

Beginning in late summer and continuing throughout the Fall and early Winter of the 1984-85 year, the planning group met frequently. There was lively dialogue and give and take about the nature and character of the principalship, changing roles for school leaders, the educational preparation of school administrators, and the content and process of continuing education and professional development programs for principals. Eventually the planning group divided into two subgroups. One subgroup focussed on assessing the needs of the more than fifteen hundred principals and assistant principals in the two counties. The other subgroup addressed the question of the financial and governance structure of the Academy. Acting on the recommendaitons of these subgroups the parent planning group of eighteen members in November 1984 adopted a statement of mission and organization for the Principals Center of the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy.

The approval of the mission and organization statement formalized the planning group as the Principals' Center Advisory Committee and the informal steering committee as the Policy Board. The Executive Director for the Academy would not be selected until June 1985. The Principals' Center Advisory Committee plannned the pilot sessions of the Academy. Three all day workshop sessions were planned on the basis of needs assessment data collected from 248 principals. The initial intent was to effectively use the resources of the major institutions and groups in the Academy in the delivery of training. The sesions included:

- Training Ground for the Battleground: Instructional Leadership and New Educational Demands
- New Perspectives: Principals Sharing with Principals
- Solitary Confinement: How the Principal Can Get (and give) Feedback

The first two sessions drew a maximum enrollment of one hundred and ten principals -- the third session attracted sixty-three principals competing against the demands of the end of school year expectations and activities ubiquitous in the life of the principalship. All sessions were evaluated by the participating principals as successful and helpful and the Principals' Center as a needed and valuable entity.

In June 1985 the members of the Policy Board of the Academy requested the Dean of the School of Human and Educational Services at Oakland University to chair the Policy Board and asked him to prepare a concept paper which would provide a conceptual framework for the future development of the Principals' Center and the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy. Reflecting on the experiences and discussions of the Principals' Center Advisory Committee in organizing and planning the pilot sessions of the Academy and the literature of educational administration and staff development, a conceptual outline of organizing principles and policy and planning issues was developed.

The outline of staff development and organizational development principles has been used as a framework to build the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy. A part time Executive Director has been employed, funded by financial support contributed by the partners in the collaboraiton. A variety of programs has been offered including the Canadian/American Principals Institute which is co-sponsored by the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy and the University of Western Ontario Leadership Centre.

Much work remains to be accomplished in developing the Meadow Brook Leadership Academy. The more we become involved in the continuing education and development of principals the more new possibilities open up. There are many lessons we have learned through collaboration in the development of the Academy's Principal's Center. Many questions have risen which continue to scratch and nick our thinking and test our assumptions and values about the continuing education of principals and the most effective means for continually renewing and revitalizing collaboration so that our collaborative process does not get stuck in a rut.

COLLABORATIVE FOR EDUCATIONAL EQUITY AND MULTICULTURAL CURRICULUM

The mission of the collaborative for Educational Equity and Multicultural Curriculum is to eliminate prejudice and discrimination and to provide quality education for all students through:

- Creation of a school structure and climate which ensures equity
- Development of a multi-cultural global curriculum
- Implementation of staff development programs and activities which confront racism

- Implementation of vigorous employment equity programs
- Improvement of instruction to promote an appreciation of cultural diversity
- Promotion of the education profession as a career for all students to reflect the ethnic, cultural, and racial diversity of society.

The Collaborative for Educational Equity and Multicultural Curriculum emerged from a series of lectures presented at Oakland University by Asa Hilliard, Fuller Callaway Professor of Urban Education at Georgia State University, who was sponsored by the School of Human and Educational Services through support from the Martin Luther King/Rosa Parks fund. During the 1987-88 lecture series Hilliard made a presentation to Bloomfield Hills School Administrators. Following his presentation discussions developed between Oakland University and Bloomfield Hills regarding a collaborative program of curriculum and instructional development to address equity, multicultural, and racial issues in education. Evolving from these discussions was a series of informal conversations with representatives from other school districts on the formation of a collaborative committed to a sustained effort to deal with instructional and curriculum development and minority recruitment. Consequently the initial organizational meeting to establish the collaborative was scheduled.

Representatives of school districts shared their history and efforts to deal with multicultural, racial, and equity issues and their interests in the collaborative. Programs implemented included curricula such as: A World of Difference, Positive Peer Influence (PPI). Many Faces of Man: the Development of a Human Dignity Policy; conflict resolution workshops for teachers and students; sensitization programs for administrators, teachers, clerical, and other support staff; exchanges with urban school districts; and energetic minority recruitment programs.

Common concerns focussed on:

Human Relations (students, teachers, administrators, community)
Minority Recruitment for administrative, teaching, and staff positions.
Instruction for at risk and culturally diverse children
Multicultural curriculum

Asa Hilliard responded to concerns by providing a perspective centering on the question: How can we mobilize the educational structure, educational resources, and educational personnel to rescue the perishable? The definition of the problem will direct activities and energies of the collaborative. If we define the problem as multicultural then we define the problem as authropological and respond by offering multicultural activities (ethnic music, dance, foods, customs, etc.) If we define the problem as an equity issue

then we define the problem in terms of sharing power, resources, and opportunities. The fundamental problem is equity -- providing access and support so minority groups have an equal opportunity for quality education, jobs, resources, and power. The challenge and job confronting education is big and complex enough that it requires a collaborative effort. Collaboration forces reflection; complementary use of resources; synergistic programming, and a broader more fundamental view of the social and economic forces impinging on educational equity.

Collaboration requires focus. Three areas of potential focus are: academic achievement, curriculum content, and socialization of youth. In terms of academic achievment we should stress maximum achievement -- not minimum competency in three areas:

Mathematics - we should be teaching the highest level of math to the lowest performers.

Literacy - the highest level of writing, speaking, and reading experiences should be provided to all children. Mastery of written language is essential to self esteem.

Thinking Skills - we need to focus on cognitive restructuring to achieve habitual critical thinking and problem solving behavior.

It was suggested that leadership seminars be developed to promote on going conversations around these issues so the collaborative would become a living consortium of thought and action. Review what's going on in instruction and curriculum, analyze, and evaluate curriculum and instruction: search for the best and most effective pedagogical and curriculum models which have worked with at risk children. People have been successful in teaching at risk children. We need to learn what is going on in urban school districts such as Los Angeles, New York, etc.

Asa turned to the question of curriculum content indicating that multicultural education ought to aim for truth and reality. We need to deconstruct current curriculum and tell another story - a non Western story of the world. Our main problem is that education has been used to create distorted perceptions, beliefs, and "truth" about minority people. By leaving out non Western history, culture, and ideas we have distorted education for everyone. Schools need to embed and integrate into all curriculum areas the ideas, literature, contributions, and history of minority groups. Portland, Oregon has developed such a curriculum. A curriculum of truth and reality provides a sense of continuity, a sense of place, self esteem, and identity. Deconstruction and revision of curriculum content is a big job and requires sustained effort. The collaborative is in a unique position to establish a model of national significance.

Asa then focussed on the problem of the school as a socializing agent. He suggested that schools have retreated from occupying youth with meaningful concurricular and extra curricular activities to expand and enrich the life space of children. The school was once a

powerful socializing force and it needs to retrieve its socializing influence. Systematic and comprehensive socialization approaches need to be developed to expand the life space of all children so they aren't intellectually and emotionally encapsulated by narrow suburban or urban environments.

Subsequent discussion following Asa Hilliard's comments included the following:

Linking human relations and staff development with curriculum development.

Sensitizing educational leadership to the complex issues of equity and institutional racism.

Getting people "ready to be ready" for dealing with issues which often are personally sensitive and emotionally laden.

Developing a mission statement for the collaborative -- why are we here -- what do we want to accomplish -- what are the outcomes we expect -- what do we want to do to achieve equity.

Tap into the dream of opportunity and the altruistic and noble nature of education -- write a mission statement.

It was agreed to take the following actions:

Establish a steering committee consisting of one representative from each institution to develop a mission statement, an agenda, and calendar for the collaborative.

Convene a superintendents group to begin the process of leadership conversation and sensitization.

Develop a schedule of visits for Asa Hilliard to consult with the collaborative.

These actions were implemented and now the Collaborative consists of twelve school districts, Oakland Schools, and Oakland University. The Collaborative has organized three major activities: a workshop on staff development programs to address racism, a workshop on designing and implementing employment equity programs, and a conference of scholars to design and implement multicultural curricula.

One of the most important functions of the Collaborative is offering a community of support for the advocacy of educational equity. The issues of racism, equity, and multiculturalism reflect systemic problems and they require systemic approaches involving the K-16 education community and a support base which emanates from a common mission and shared values.

LESSONS LEARNED; CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE COLLABORATION

Reflecting on the lessons we have learned from our experiences in the development and implementation of educational collaboratives, we believe that effective institutional collaboration is characterized by the following elements:

Specific Purpose

Since virtually every educational institution now recognizes that it cannot fulfill its mission by itself, there is widespread interest in joint endeavors. For example, pre-service training of teachers, traditionally thought of as the exclusive preserve of colleges and universities, with a small contribution from local school districts at the student teaching phase, is now recognized as part of a continuum that starts at the college level and ends only upon the teacher's retirement.

Teacher educators and practicing teachers and administrators must work together to design the teacher training curriculum to assure a program that relates to the reality entering teachers will face. Growing emphasis on, and in some states mandated requirements for, continuing education for professional teachers requires that colleges and local districts cooperate to assure that training for experienced teachers is relevant and that university staff are truly capable of providing state of the art instruction to seasoned veterans.

The general recognition that educational institutions must work together does not assure successful collaboration as that term is defined in this paper. Though it is a good first step for educational agencies at different levels to recognize that they must work together, and therefore start to build the network of personal relationships that will be necessary for a successful collaboration, each project that is taken on as a collaborative endeavor must have clear goals and a commonly held view that the results of this joint endeavor are likely to be more complete and successful than any result that might be achieved if any of the partners attacked the problem alone.

A successful collaboration is also most likely to occur when projects chosen are clearly central to the mission of each of the partners and likely can be managed within available resources. Though outside funding from whatever source is often an effective catalyst to getting joint projects off to a quick start, dependence on such funds often dooms these projects to quick termination as soon as the additional revenue dries up.

Thus successful collaboration, although it requires an umbrella of institutional good will and understanding, must be driven by specific projects that are consistent with the mission of each partner, more achieved by working together rather than separately, and important enough for all partners to allocate resources on hand to start the effort.

Clear Roles

If a collaborative endeavor is, by definition, one that is taken on because the synergy of joint effort is likely to produce a better result than any effort by one of the partners acting alone, then it follows that each partner must bring something unique to the project. Surfacing these unique contributions in the planning stage can have salutary effects.

Having clear expectations of each partner at the outset builds a sense of responsibility for each to fulfill anticipated roles. It requires each participant to sequester necessary resources so they can be called on when needed to achieve the purposes of the group. It builds appreciation of the added value that each cooperating agency brings to the joint endeavor.

In a collaborative effort to provide training for administrators in the region Oakland University, Oakland Schools and the Macomb ISD made some clear decisions about role during conceptualization of the program. The Meadow Brook Leadership Academy would be headquartered at the university because of the prestige that university affiliation would bring and because of the unusual attractiveness and comfort of the mansion where some early programs were offered. It was further determined that programs for practicing building principals would be jointly promoted and conducted under the auspices of a part-time director hired by funds contributed by all partners. Each had a role in this endeavor because intermediate districts had ready access to communicating information about Academy programs to building principals, all institutions were positioned to offer CEUs, and the university would be able to grant graduate credit. The intermediate units would continue responsibility to offer awareness programs for teachers interested in becoming school leaders but not yet ready to make a commitment to enter a graduate program and not yet in position to join in Academy programs for practicing school administrators.

Knowing roles at the start of the effort avoided disputes over "turf" and surprises when it was necessary for each partner to contribute funds to hire a director.

Support from the Chief Executive

The larger the institution, the greater the gulf between those working to deliver services and those responsible to make finance and policy decisions. A large university with multiple colleges is beset with many demands for the allocation of scarce resources. A president trying to decide whether to put more money into the college of education or the engineering school faces very difficult choices.

Similar problems exist on a smaller scale in a school district. Too often school boards and superintendents must decide whether to settle a contract for an additional percent of salary increase, and thereby prevent a strike, or hold out money for curriculum changes carefully studied by faculty over a long period. If the money goes to salary, teachers who see their curriculum work go back on the self

are disappointed and discouraged. Their future participation in further efforts of this kind are unlikely.

Developing a collaborative effort is like negotiating a master contract for teachers. The people "at the table" must be able to deliver on promises to the other institutions or face skepticism whenever future joint endeavors are proposed. If the chief executive has a clear understanding of the value of a collaborative effort and approves, whenever necessary, the allocation of resources to carry out the endeavor, the project can proceed with everyone feeling a sense of trust and confidence. Each successful effort breeds optimism that further projects will be successful.

Parity Relationships

Collaboration requires that all parties work with parity and assume equal responsibility to identify, inquire into, and address mutual problems and goals. A parity relationship recognizes and utilizes the unique insights and skills provided by each participant while, at the same time, demanding that no set of capabilities is assigned a superior status. There is a work with rather than a work on posture. There is no implicit idealogy of paternalism, control and non-reciprocity between experts and "helpers" which in the past too often characterized cooperative relationships between universities and public schools.

Throughout the formation of the collaboratives cited in the case studies the language of "educational improvement" has purposely been used in place of "school improvement." The major goal of the collaboratives is the improvement of education K-16. The collaboratives operate on the assumption that local schools, intermediate school districts, universities, and the state department of education are all parts of a single educational system which must work and improve together. Universities need improvement as much as K-12 schools. Hence the goal of "educational improvement K-16" embodies the work with principle in which all parties seek to improve themselves through collaboration. There is no special status accruing to particular kinds of expertise or to institutional titles and roles. Institutional partners focus on the synergy of collaboration - on what they can accomplish through a parity relationship that they can not do alone.

Institutional Commitment

Our educational collaboratives operate and maintain themselves without "soft" money or external grants. Resources - people, material, facilities, financial - are shared to support the collaboratives. There is firm institutional commitment to collaboration.

1. Through the collaboratives the university has appointed teachers as research associates whose primary function is to design and document local research and development efforts.

2. Participating university faculty are released for one-third of their time each semester to participate on site in school based curriculum and staff development efforts.

3. Intermediate school districts and the university, share facilities, materials, and operational costs to support the collaboratives.

4. The university and the intermediate school districts release staff and faculty to provide personnel for staffing the administration of the collaboratives.

5. Local school districts contribute personnel by providing substitute teachers to release classroom teachers for participation in the collaboratives.

The collaboratives have sought external funding for special projects but the existence of the collaboratives is not dependent on "soft" money. Our experience suggests that if educational institutions are not committed to building collaboration with their own resources then collaboration will be short lived. We believe long term institutional commitment is the sine qua non of collaboration.

Collaboration is Understood and Supported by Shared Values

In effective partnerships collaboration is understood and accepted as a sustained mutually beneficial and dialogical process. There is discussion and inquiry about the purposes of collaboration. Problems and goals are mutually defined. Action proceeds from collaborative inquiry and agreement on strategy.

It is imperative that members of the collaborating institutions be brought together initially to deliberate on collaboration. This is seldom done. We cannot gratuitously assume collaboration will happen if we bring people together as members of a task force or committee. It is essential to concentrate on what collaboration is and what it demands. Administrators, teachers and university faculty need to learn how to collaborate and deal with significant questions about the process. What is collaboration? What does it involve? What does it cost? What are its risks? What are its benefits? Am I ready to pay the costs and give up something to get the benefits which accrue from collaboration? How do we help each other in the process? What are the ground rules for making decisions? Collaboration is a dialectical and dialogical process with give and take which requires that administrators, university faculty and classroom teachers build trust, communicate and solve problems together from the beginning. Members of the partnership need to prepare themselves for dealing with the conflicts which naturally emanate from the interface of the different norms, behavioral regularities, and values of the university and the school. Collaboration is not achieved naturally. It is a sophisticated process which is acquired and learned deliberately over time.

The development of collaboration is not a straight line but a series of hills and valleys. The process of collaboration is circular, iterative, and sometimes discontinuous. It is not a mere mechanical matching of needs and capabilities followed by a definition of objectives and a working plan and schedule. It is, more importantly, an exercise in

mutuality where understanding and shared values are more important than contracting; where personal contacts outweigh administrative mechanism; and where there is a climate that encourages an unbindered flow of new ideas, a willingness to confront differences as they arise, and a desire to arrive at solutions in spite of the obstacles that may present themselves. (Matthews and Norgaard, 1984)

This is not to suggest that structure and ground rules are not important. Improving communications, developing positive norms, and promoting interpersonal good will are necessary but not sufficient conditions for successful collaboration. Attempting to promote collaboration only by adding a human relations overlay onto existing management structures and systems can consume even the most determined of collaborative processes. Collaboration can be best achieved by the design of creative, fluid, and flexible structures which remove institutional barriers and promote interdependence, reciprocal relationships, and permeable organizational boundaries.

Each successful collaborative effort provides impetus to more joint efforts. Institutions operate successfully together when their representatives recognize that concerns and objections usually flow from different experiences, different institutional rules, and/or differing legal obligations. Mutually derived solutions cannot happen until each party to the collaborative endeavor accepts the other's good faith and attempts to understand the experiences and premises from which the partner is operating. An intellectual appreciation of the added value provided by collaboration can provide the motivation to show patience even when the reservoir of patience appears empty.

A Focus On Action

Successful collaboration must focus on action and not just machinery. Although common understanding is essential at the very beginning, and basic ground rules need to be in place partners need not defer action until each and every issue is settled. We believe that collaboratives succeed by taking root in action implemented in local areas and serving local needs. "Think globally act locally" best describes the principle of action which leads to successful collaboration.

The issue here is that of tension between means (collaboration) and an end (improved education). Action should lead to reflection which in turn should lead to new actions. There must be willingness and risk to engage in purposeful action before all the issues of collaboration are settled. It is through action that the fundamental issues of collaboration emerge and that the depth of institutional relationships and commitments is verified. Ultimately the norms for collaboration and the bonding of institutions are determined by engagement in action.

THE ADVANTAGES OF COLLABORATION

Results of these program initiatives in Oakland County have demonstrated several obvious advantages to collaboration:

- Collaboration achieves the interaction of two aims - the advancement of knowledge and the improvement of practice.

- Collaboration insures that the interests, questions, and problems of professional practice are reflected in the programs and research of the university along with the data drawn from the theoretical and empirical literature.

- Collaboration provides reciprocal and collegial working relationships between university faculty and public school educators and a common, shared experience for reflection, learning, and growth.

- Collaboration reduces redundancies and overlapping of resources and finances by developing mechanisms for sharing resources and financial support.

- Collaboration encourages the integration of research and services, the integration of preservice and inservice education, and a generative cycle of knowledge - action - reflection - knowledge - action - reflection.

- Collaboration creates a new ecology for stimulating professional growth and staff development for both university faculty and public school educators.

PROBLEMS TO BE FACED IN BUILDING EDUCATIONAL COLLABORATIVES

Educational collaboratives cannot be built overnight. There are many problems involved in the development of authentic partnerships between higher education and public schools.

One problem is that of mutual respect. University people are often seen by others as impractical, ivory tower dwellers. Professors, on the other hand, often see others as fine workers in the field who have no theoretical grasp of what they are doing. Teachers association representatives are often viewed as narrowly interested in only the monetary aspects of teacher welfare. Administrators and professors are often seen as paternalistic status seekers who don't know what it is like in the classroom. What one party calls integrity the other calls self interest. Overcoming preconceptions and sterotypes and building a basis for effective cooperation takes time and patience. Each representative of each constituency has to be given time to express his/her personal and institutional points of view and to absorb the views of others.

Based on our accumulated experience with educational collaboratives, we know that effective partnerships are based on thoughtful, often time consuming, consideration of the most efficient and equitable operating, decision making, and problem solving procedures. Success requires clarification of authority to commit resources, support, and cooperation. There must be patience, staying power, and hard work in communicating with

constituents and working toward a feeling of constituent ownership of objectives and products. There must be realism in understanding the complexities and demands of such an undertaking, and the time and effort necessary to attain objectives. Finally, there must be mutual commitment to the idea that collaboration brings collective power, collective competencies, and a broad base of knowledge and experience to address far more effectively the major issues confronting education today.

Communication is imperative. The nature of collaboration, however, puts a strain on communication creating a diseconomy of scale. Frequent interactions among all institutional partners at all levels are a necessity. Large, small group, and one to one meetings are a continuous requirement. This kind of communication takes time, energy, patience, and commitment.

There must also be personal maturity on the part of those who represent different agencies in a collaborative. When institutional partners are involved in a variety of collaborative endeavors, it is likely that each will play a greater or lesser role in each activity, depending on which agency has a greater set of resources applicable to the problem to be solved or goal to be addressed.

Innovative collaboratives are vulnerable to personal jealousies and institutional competition. Therefore, it is imperative that collaborative partners anticipate such problems, develop a plan to assure that all parties receive equal credit when projects are completed, even though contributions in any one project may have been unequal, and carry out frequent formative evaluations regarding the effectiveness of the relationship.

NEED FOR A THEORY OF EDUCATIONAL COLLABORATIVES

Educational collaboratives involving a state department of education, colleges and universities, intermediate school districts, and local district teachers and administrators in whatever combination fits a particular need will function most effectively once research is able to establish, and public policy implement, clearer definitions of role in the educational delivery system.

One collaborative of which the authors are aware did not reach its maximum potential because of a lack of clear focus in law and funding policy for the potential partners.

The project was entitled "Retraining and Reassigned Teachers" and was developed in the late 1970s to give additional training and support to teachers who were being reassigned to grades and subjects with which they were marginally familiar at best because of reduction in force (RIF) personnel actions.

The effort could have been an ideal vehicle for collaboration between university, ISD, and local staff. Supporting theory for the initial conceptualization of the project assumed that the unviersity is, by definition, the developer and dispenser of knowledge. Reassigned teachers

were, in many ways, analogous to preservice teachers in their need for additional subject area knowledge (science, reading, music, whatever the area of the new assignment).

The ISD would bring teachers together from various districts to help with basic ideas about good teaching in any subject (The Madeline Hunter generic teaching skills model was used) and to provide a vehicle of group therapy and self help since most teachers were most unhappy with their new assignments.

The local district would identify a "peer facilitator" for each person, a teacher recognized as very competent in the grade or field to which the individual was reassigned and who would function as consultant and comrade to the reassigned teacher at the school site. The facilitators were trained by the ISD.

The paradigm didn't work because universities had no method to make staff available for this type of training since their funding was credit driven. The only way to employ professors to provide content instruction would have been to hire them as private consultants. University participation was dropped from the model in this instance.

Since there is growing acceptance that institutional collaboration is both cost effective and cost efficient, it will be necessary to think clearly about effective models of preservice and inservice education and design more flexible funding systems to broaden opportunities for collaboration.

SUMMARY

Educational institutions cannot afford to operate in isolation from each other. By pooling and redirecting resources, and making them complementary, we can better serve ourselves, and most importantly, the children, adolescents and adults in our schools. Through carefully planned collaboration between higher education and local district personnel, schools can become centers of vibrant learning for children, teachers, and university faculty. The relationships between public schools, colleges and universities can be developed to the point where each is considered an extension of the other in regard to teacher education and the improvement of education. Effective educational collaboratives demonstrate that we can, through partnerships, complement resources and integrate theory with practice and research with action in responding to the complex and demanding challenge of improving the quality of education.

Institutional collaboration can happen, must happen, is happening because there is no other option. It is a matter of survival. America's economic future and its ability to support an aging population with fewer workers is appearing on the agenda of all the nation's institutions, public and private. No one, said John Donne, is an island. No one sector of the economy can do it alone. We will, said Benjamin Franklin, hang together or we will hang separately.

REFERENCES

Hodgkinson, Harold (1983). "Characterization of Higher Education and Industry." Paper presented at the NCHEMS National Assembly, Denver, Colorado, February 9-11.

Matthews, J.B. and Norgaard, R. (1984). Managing the Partnership Between Higher Education and Industry. Boulder, Colorado. National Center for Higher Education Systems.

Thomas, Lewis (1980). "On the Uncertainty of Science." Harvard Magazine. September/October pp. 19-22.)

Toffler, Alvin (1980). The Third Wave. New York, William Morrow Company.